UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,554	04/10/2006	Yoshiaki Hirose	YMUCP011	8941
	7590 01/25/201 Villeneuve & Sampson	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 7025	0	GREGORIO, GUINEVER S		
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1793		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/575,554	HIROSE, YOSHIAKI	
	Examiner	A ( 1 1 ! 4	
	Examiner	Art Unit	

		GOINEVER 3. GREGORIO	1793					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE	REPLY FILED <u>30 December 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
1. 🛚	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.						
b)	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
have I under set foi may re	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
	CE OF APPEAL	Page 2 11 07 OFD 44 07 mg at he f	71 - d - 20-2- ( 0-	6 (   - ( 6				
	The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed winDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
	(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT						
	(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for				
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
	NOTE: <u>Applicant's proposed amendments will not than vapor-deposited graphite fibers" or "natural grequire further consideration.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and the second	raphite or kish graphite". The propo						
4. П	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOI -324)				
5. 🏻	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane / mioriamione (i	1 02 02 1).				
6.	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. 🛛	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
	Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .							
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
<u>AFFII</u>	DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. 🔲	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
	showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
	The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
	Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ( Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	elvin Curtis Mayes/ ervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/GUINEVER S GREGO Examiner, Art Unit 1793	RIO/					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner is not convinced that the invention taught by Shane et al. (Pat. No. 3,404,061) would not produce a product which would meet the limitations recited by Applicant. Applicant cites column 12, line 22 where Shane et al. teaches a preliminary measurement of the thermal conductivities for the graphite sheet at a particular temperature. Examiner believes that the graphite sheet taught by Shane et al. would be able to meet the thermal conductivity limitation claimed by Applicant If the thermal conductivity where taken at a different temperature.

Furthermore, Noromichi (Japanese Pat. No. JP-2566244) cited in a previous office action expressly teaches a graphite sheet with thermal conductivity greater than 140 W/m K which would obviously encompass Applicant's claimed thermal conductivity.